MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF DISTRICT'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

MILLER BROWN & DANNIS

MILLER BROWN & DANNIS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11 12 13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

avoid unnecessary duplication of effort by the parties and the Court, and prevent the presentation of duplicative evidence and argument. Fed.R.Civ.Pro. Rule 42(a); Declaration of S. Sutherland; see also generally, United States EPA v. City of Green Forest, Ark., 921 F.2d 1394, 1402 (8th Cir. 1990) (grant or denial of motion to consolidate is in trial court's discretion and will not be reversed absent clear error or exigent circumstances).

The cases should be consolidated because both cases involve the same parties and are based on the same or similar claims and events. Both parties seek review of the same underlying administrative proceeding, convened pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act ("IDEA"), 20 U.S.C. sections 1400 et seq., and adjudication of rights under the IDEA, including both parties' rights to fees incurred in the underlying due process hearing. More specifically, both cases pertain to the same student, same family, same school district, same school year, same counsel, and same offers of a free, appropriate public education. Thus, in furtherance of judicial economy and due process, the Court should consolidate both cases.

III. **CONCLUSION**

On this basis, the District respectfully requests this Court consolidate its action, 08 CV 0039, with T.B.'s first filed pending action, 08 CV 0028, such that the issues will be litigated and decided concurrently.

DATED: February 26, 2008

MILLER BROWN & DANNIS

By: _/s/ Sarah L.W. Sutherland SARAH L. W. SUTHERLAND

Attorneys for San Diego Unified School District

MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

Document 9-2 Filed 02/26/2008

Page 3 of 3

Case 3:08-cv-00028-WQH-WMC

LB 101666v1